

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

LAFFON GLYMPH,

Plaintiff,

v.

CT CORPORATION SYSTEMS et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-01704-JHC

ORDER AFFIRMING DENIAL
(DKT. NO. 46) OF PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECUSAL (DKT.
NO. 45)

This matter comes before the Court on Judge John H. Chun's order (Dkt. No. 46) denying Plaintiff's motion for recusal (Dkt. No. 45). Local Civil Rule 3(f) provides that when a judge in this District declines to voluntarily recuse himself from a case following a party's motion to recuse pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144 or 28 U.S.C. § 455, he "will direct the clerk to refer the motion to the chief judge."

Recusal is required if a judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned or if the judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), (b)(1). Critically, bias or prejudice sufficient to warrant recusal must derive from an extrajudicial source. *Agha-*

1 *Khan v. Mortgage Elec. Registration Sys., Inc.*, 2022 WL 501564, at *1 (9th Cir. Feb. 18, 2022).
2 In other words, prior adverse rulings of a judge will not require recusal. *Mayes v. Leipziger*, 729
3 F.2d 605, 607 (9th Cir. 1984); *see also United States v. Arant*, 2007 WL 3348443, at *1 (W.D.
4 Wash. Nov. 9, 2007) (instructing that “[a] litigant cannot . . . use the recusal process to remove a
5 judge based on adverse rulings”)

6 Plaintiff’s request for recusal asserts a belief that Judge Chun “has a personal bias or
7 prejudice against [her] in favor of the opposing party.” (Dkt. No. 25 at 2.) Plaintiff’s contention
8 is based entirely on Judge Chun’s dismissal of complaints filed by Plaintiff (*id.* at 2–4) which she
9 characterizes as representing “consistent[] rul[ings] in favor of the defendant without sufficient
10 justification” (*id.* at 4).

11 As Plaintiff exclusively takes issue with prior rulings of Judge Chun and has cited no
12 extrajudicial source from which the Court could find bias or prejudice, the Court AFFIRMS
13 Judge Chun’s denial (Dkt. No. 46) of Plaintiff’s motion for recusal (Dkt. No. 45). *See Agha-*
14 *Khan*, 2022 WL 501564, at *1; *Mayes*, 729 F.2d at 607; *Arant*, 2007 WL 3348443, at *1.

15 Dated this 29th day of January 2024.

16
17 

18 _____
David G. Estudillo
United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24